



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,562	12/05/2001	Daniel R. Salomon	302018.3003-100	2653

30407 7590 01/24/2005

BOWDITCH & DEWEY, LLP
161 WORCESTER ROAD
P.O. BOX 9320
FRAMINGHAM, MA 01701-9320

EXAMINER

MOHAMED, ABDEL A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1653

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/006,562

Applicant(s)

SALOMON ET AL.

Examiner

Abdel A. Mohamed

Art Unit

1653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

CONTINUED EXAMINATION UNDER 37 CFR 1.114 AFTER FINAL REJECTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/1/04 has been entered.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF AMENDMENT, REMARKS AND STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

2. The amendment and remarks filed 12/1/04 are acknowledged, entered and considered. In view of Applicant's request claims 1 and 13 have been amended and claims 25-36 have been canceled. Claims 1-24 are now pending in the application. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the prior art of record is maintained.

ARGUMENTS ARE NOT PERSUASIVE

CLAIMS REJECTION-35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-24 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawrocki et al (Transplantation Proceedings, Vol. 28, No. 6, pp. 3538-3539, 1996) taken with Cramer et al (Transplantation Proceedings, Vol. 29, page 616, 1997) and Schmid et al (Eur. Surg. Res., Vol. 30, pp-61-68, 1998).

Applicant's arguments filed 12/1/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. It is noted that Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 13 to recite "wherein chronic allograft rejection is determined by histological examination and amelioration is associated with no more than mild lymphocyte infiltration in the myocardium and limited transplant arteriosclerosis". Applicant's argument that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the prior art of record is moot in view of the present amendment is unpersuasive. Contrary to Applicant's arguments, the determination of chronic allograft rejection by histological examination would not change the outcome of the methods (i.e., methods of ameliorating and preventing chronic

Art Unit: 1653

allograft rejections as claimed in claims 1 and 13, respectively). Further, the limitations upon which Applicant has argued is taught by the secondary reference of Cramer et al on page 616, under the heading "Methods" which clearly states that heart samples were subjected to histological examination and vascular lesions were analyzed with a computerized digital image system. Thus, clearly showing the determination of histological examination on chronically rejected allograft.

Therefore, for the reasons discussed in the previous Office action and in view of the above, the combined teachings of the prior art makes obvious a method of ameliorating or preventing chronic allograft rejection including arterial atherosclerosis by administering effective amount of cyclosporin in combination with 2-CDA and a pharmaceutical formulation for administration thereof including the limitations as currently amended in claims 1 and 13. Thus, it is made obvious by the combined teachings of the prior art since the instantly claimed invention which falls within the scope of the combined teachings of the prior art method would have been *prima facie* obvious from said prior art disclosure to a person of ordinary skill in the art because as held in host of cases including *Ex parte Harris*, 748 O.G. 586; *In re Rosselete*, 146 USPQ 183; *In re Burgess*, 149 USPQ 355 and as exemplified by *In re Best*, "the test of obviousness is not express suggestion of the claimed invention in any and all of the references but rather what the references taken collectively would suggest to those of ordinary skill in the art presumed to be familiar with them".

**ACTION IS FINAL, FIRST ACTION FOLLOWING REQUEST FOR CONTINUED
EXAMINATION UNDER 37 CFR 1.114**

4. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE CORRESPONDENCE


5. No claim is allowed.

Art Unit: 1653


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abdel A. Mohamed whose telephone number is (571) 272 0955. The examiner can normally be reached on First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jon P. Weber can be reached on (571) 272 0925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



JON WEBER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

 Mohamed/AAM
January, 18, 2005